MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 27, 1936.

The eleventh meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1936, was held in its office in the Navy Department Building on March 27, 1936. The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Clarke,
Mr. Lawrie,
Mr. Howells,
Mr. Savage,
Mr. Borie,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Executive Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meetings held January 31 and March 12, 1936, were approved.

2. STATUE OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN: Under date of March 18, 1936, the following letter was received from Mr. Edward B. Rowan, Superintendent of the Section of Painting and Sculpture, Treasury Department, with which he submitted a large model of a statue of Benjamin Franklin by William Zorach for the Postmaster General's reception room:

March 18, 1936.

Dear Mr. Moore:

Mr. William Zorach has submitted the second stage of his work on the statue of Benjamin Franklin for the Postmaster General's Reception Room, Post Office Department Building, Washington, D. C.

On September 26, the Commission reported that the sketch previously submitted had not been sufficiently developed, and that they would prefer to wait until a more studied and definite model was submitted before commenting on it.

Mr. Zorach was instructed to carry his work further, and it is now ready for submission to the Commission of Fine Arts for its comment and advice.

In view of the fact that this figure is in plaster, 3'10" in height, with a heavy base, it presents some difficulties in getting it to your office for the meeting of the Commission. It would be a great convenience if the Commission could review the work in this office, Room 411, Procurement Division, 7th and D Streets, S. W. If, however, their schedule is too full to include this trip it will, of course, be sent to your office for review by the Commission.

I shall appreciate hearing from you relative to this matter.

Cordially yours,
(Signed) Edward B. Rowan, Superintendent,
Section of Painting and Sculpture.

The model, standing on a 20-inch pedestal, was exhibited in the office of the Commission where it was inspected. Mr. Lawrie gave it particular attention. He noted that the large figure had not at all been changed from the small model and made the following criticisms: The model lacks the character of Franklin and also the masculinity that was Franklin's. The figure is hardly seven heads high. The costume does not have the character of the times and the arrangement of the cloak as held by the arms seems unreasonable. Mr. Lawrie summed up the criticisms by saying that the statue is a very bad thing. Benjamin Franklin was one of the great men of his times but this figure does not show it and the model is far below the work of the artist.

The Commission concurred in the criticisms of Mr. Lawrie and recommended that Mr. Zorach make a new model for the statue embodying the criticisms above mentioned. (Exhibit A)

3. PORTRAIT OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN: Mr. Moore read the following letter received from Dr. Joseph Downs, Curator of the Department of the American Wing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, regarding the portrait of Benjamin Franklin, which is in the White House:

March 26, 1936.

Dear Mr. Moore:

I am very glad that we are going to be able to show the Benjamin Wilson portrait of Benjamin Franklin from the White House in our forthcoming exhibition of Franklin and his circle. Thank you for what you have done in our behalf in securing the loan of this interesting likeness.

There is some doubt as to how the portrait should be labeled--that is, the ownership. May I trouble you to let me know, at your convenience, how it should be acknowledged in our catalogue?

Trusting we will have the pleasure of seeing you here during the exhibition, I am

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) Joseph Downs,
Curator.

Mr. Moore said this portrait by Benjamin Wilson was in Franklin's house in Philadelphia when the British occupied that city and was taken to England when the British left. The portrait was in private possession in England when the British Embassy some years ago arranged through Earl Grey (then Governor General of Canada) to have the portrait returned to the United States and placed in the White House. Mr. Moore said President Roosevelt has agreed to loaning the portrait for the exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum during the summer. (Exhibit B)

4. AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME: Mr. Moore read the following letter from Mr. Chester A. Aldrich, Director of the American Academy in Rome:

March 13, 1936.

Dear Mr. Moore:

Thank you for your letter of March 3rd concerning the delegate to the International Congress on the History of Art. I would propose for this post Mr. John Walker III who is Associate in Charge of Fine Arts here at the Academy. He would be glad to attend at his own expense. He is admirably fitted for the post having specialized in the History of Art at Harvard where he was associated with Mr. Forbes, Mr. Sachs, and later with Mr. Berenson over here.

Concerning the letter from the Department of State of which you enclose a copy, we had received a note from the Italian Ministry of

Foreign Affairs some weeks ago through our Embassy here, and had taken it up at once with the Ministry of Finance with whom we are still discussing some questions concerning past payments and other matters in this connection.

We are all hard at work here at the Academy in spite of political conditions and the uncertain future. I enclose a clipping which may interest you concerning one of our activities. There are practically no travelers here although we are all very comfortable and wholly unmolested.

Please give my warm regards to my friends on the Fine Arts Commission and keep for yourself my cordial thanks and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Chester Aldrich,
Director.

The Commission were pleased to hear from Mr. Aldrich.

5. G. A. R. MEMORIAL: Under date of March 25, 1936, the following letter was received from Mrs. K. Rahn, requesting the advice of the Commission as to a memorial for the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War:

March 25, 1936.

The Commission of Fine Arts,
Navy Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sirs:

The Grand Army of the Republic Encampment will be held in Washington, D. C., the week of September 20, 1936. Also the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, 1861-1865 hold their Annual Convention at the same time.

Each year the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War place a Memorial to our Fathers "Grand Army of the Republic", Union Veterans in the convention city. We ask you, as per my conversation with you in your office on Wednesday, March 25, to suggest a PROMINENT and suitable site for the said Memorial and permission to complete our arrangements for the dedication.

We have placed each year in the convention city either a Stone Bench, Sun Dial, Drinking Fountain, Tablet, Flag Pole and a large Flag not to exceed approximately six hundred dollars ($600.00)

We cannot decide upon the cost of said Memorial until we know what is suitable and the site which is in the hands of the Commission of Fine Arts.

If you will place this before your meeting on Friday, March 27, 1936 (as per your suggestion) and advise me at once I shall then get in touch with our National President, Mrs. Agnes Upell Boyce, who will then come to Washington, D. C., and complete arrangements. This Memorial must be erected and completed for dedication by September 20, 1936.

Trusting to hear from you as soon as possible, I am

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Mrs. Mattie R. Tucker,
National Treasurer,
1326--18th Street, N. W.,
National Headquarters,
Washington, D. C.

(Signed) Mrs. K. Rahn,
Acting for the Committee,
143 Uhland Terrace, N. E.,
Washington, D. C.
Past National Inspector.

Mr. Moore thought they might put a drinking fountain out at Fort Stevens, where Lincoln was under fire during the defense of the city in 1864, but it would require an Act of Congress to put it there. Mr. Lawrie felt a drinking fountain could not be made beautiful. After consideration the Commission decided that it would be appropriate to place a marble bench in the Georgia Avenue military cemetery near Fort Stevens. Mr. Moore said that recently the War Department built a pergola in the cemetery. The Commission advised that the memorial bench should be designed by a good architect. (Exhibit C)

6. COLONIAL SETTLERS MONUMENT: The Commission gave further consideration to the question of location of the Colonial Settlers Monument. Mr. Moore said he had given some thought to the matter since the meeting in New York on March 12, and had suggested to Mr. Delos Smith, the architect, a site on the axis of the Department of Commerce Building west of 15th Street. The site is satisfactory to Mr. Smith and to the Daughters of Union Veterans.

The Commission after consideration approved this location for the memorial and later in the day visited the site and there considered the location appropriate for it.

The design for the monument was then given attention. The Commission felt it would be better to use granite than limestone. Mr. Lawrie noted the sketches for sculptural relief designed by Carl Mose. These are to be placed at the base of the shaft and are to be symbolic of pioneer pursuits, representing tobacco, maize, the herring and the squirrel. Mr. Lawrie felt that these objects should be carved into the stone rather than in the form of a panel. The Commission concurred in this criticism. (Exhibit D)

7. LIGHTNING RODS AT GREAT ENTRANCE TO ARLINGTON: Mr. Moore reported that during a visit to Arlington cemetery a few days ago with Mr. Fraser they noted lightning rods on the eagles at the Great Entrance to Arlington. These rods, of course, look very objectionable, and Mr. Fraser said there is absolutely no need for them. On inquiry it was ascertained that Mr. Nagle had recommended placing them on the eagles on the advice of the Bureau of Standards. It was reported that lightning struck the Arlington Memorial Bridge not so long ago and shattered a part of the balustrade. The Commission deplored the use of these lightning rods and Mr. Moore prepared a report recommending that they be removed. The Commission concurred in this and the report was sent to the Director of the National Park Service. (Exhibit E)

8. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE EXTENSION: The Commission gave further consideration to the revised design submitted by the Supervising Architect for the extension of the Government Printing Office buildings. Mr. Simon stated that he had considered the recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts made at the Commission meeting on March 12, but had found it difficult to adopt some of them and, therefore, arranged to have the Architectural Advisory Board of the Treasury Department confer with the Commission in regard to the matter. Accordingly there were present with Mr. Simon: Mr. Abel, who drew the plans,

and the following members of the Architectural Advisory Board: Mr. Klauder, Chairman, Mr. Shepley, Mr. Maher, and Mr. Embury. Mr. Klauder made an explanatory statement as to the plans, saying that his committee had given most thorough consideration to the project and prepared the design from the standpoint of buildings appropriate for North Capitol Street and the needs of the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Klauder said: "A design was made for a building 500 feet long and 80 feet wide of the warehouse type. This was disapproved by your Commission and a new design was submitted showing a pilaster treatment on the assumption that this would conform to Washington Governmental architecture.

"At our second meeting we felt it was not a full solution of the problem and we added a second story to contain the railroad tracks, the exterior wall so designed as to mark it with a strong horizontal band. With this in mind we tried to plan an elevation for a building that would have a strong base line. Then we considered the Post Office Building and saw it had a strong base line. Shortly thereafter we were told that there was money enough for only a concrete building.

"Then about that time we had before us the question of an additional building for the extension of the main Government Printing Office building. The Commission felt that the building is very badly designed and has a very ugly color; and since North Capitol Street might be developed for Government Buildings the extension should be of stone. The question was raised whether or not the little cul-de-sac between the two buildings should remain or whether one continuous building should be built north to H Street. The Committee decided that the front of the Government Printing Office should be stripped off and made over so as to comport with the design of the new building, and so that there should be one continuous building to H Street.

"Now going back to the warehouse, it was thought that there should be an echo of the base line of the Post Office although the buildings could be of different level. The loading platform on the second floor has to have a monitor skylight to get rid of the steam of the locomotives so we suggested that the wall be treated plainly but that it be divided into vertical joints to add to the design. The committee considered North Capitol Street a street of prime importance."

Mr. Moore raised the question whether or not all the railroad tracks are electrified in Union Station so as to obviate the necessity of steam locomotives, but it was pointed out that the Baltimore & Ohio does not have electrified tracks although they may be a few years hence.

As to the main building of the Government Printing Office, Mr. Embury said that the Public Printer complains that the lighting of the present building is inadequate, that its design lacks simplicity, its color is bad and that the building as a whole is a blemish in that part of the city.

Mr. Abel presented a scheme for the bridge across First Street to connect with the railroad. Mr. Abel said that after going over the subject a number of times they concluded a skeleton bridge in as orderly a manner as possible is the best solution. They made all the girders and supports of the same height for the sake of appearance. He said it took more time to study the bridge than to make the design for the new building.

The Commission discussed the plans and after consideration approved the design for the warehouse, the viaduct and for the extension of the main building north to H Street as presented. A report approving the designs was sent to Mr. Simon. (Exhibit F)

9. JUSSERAND MEMORIAL: The National Park Service through Mr. Malcolm Kirkpatrick presented a landscape plan for the Jusserand Memorial in the Rock

Creek Parkway between P Street and Massachusetts Avenue. Mr. Clarke thought the design too formal and incorrect in that it recognized an axis in the wrong direction--it ought to be informal and lengthwise in its treatment. He also did not like the steps because they would attract people to them through the traffic. Mr. Moore said all the people interested in the Jusserand Memorial want is just a little sunken garden along informal lines, that is, a part of a naturalistic park. Mr. Finnan wondered in view of the traffic situation if they perhaps could not find a better place where the people could use the gardento greater advantage. Mr. Moore noted that there are many people who walk in the park and this would make a little resting place. Mr. Finnan made objection to the placing of memorials in Rock Creek Park, none of which have been placed there since the Rock Creek Parkway plan was adopted in 1908. Mr. Moore called attention to the fireplaces, which Mr. Finnan admitted are anything but sightly. Mr. Clarke again emphasized his apprehensiveness about the traffic situation, the increasing traffic at this point and the total inadequacy of the roads. He wondered if in the great area of Rock Creek Park there is not a better site, for this location would just be creating another excuse for people to cross the roads. It was believed that a place along the creek but some little distance from the picnic grounds would be good.

It was concluded that the architectural scheme presented by Mr. Kendall of McKim, Mead and White in connection with this landscape plan was too large considering the limited amount of money available. Also as Mr. Clarke pointed out there is a traffic hazard involved in the erection of the memorial at this location. Thereupon it was decided to adopt a simplified scheme for the memorial. A letter was sent to Dr. Francklyn Paris, Chairman of the Committee, and a memorandum to the National Park Service. (Exhibit G)

10. ELM TREES ALONG CONSTITUTION AVENUE: Under date of February 4, 1936, the following letter was received from Mr. C. Marshall Finnan, Superintendent of National Capital Parks, requesting the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to planting elm trees along Constitution Avenue between Sixth and Fifteenth Streets:

February 4, 1936.

Dear Dr. Moore:

It has come to my attention that there have been suggestions to the effect that the Elm Trees along Constitution Avenue on the side adjacent to the new triangle buildings should not be planted.

I should like to get established as soon as possible whatever trees are to be finally required, and I would appreciate your letting me know whether or not the trees are to be planted along the north side of the Avenue from Sixth to Fifteenth Street. Presumably, the thought in omitting these trees is to insure an unobstructed view of the facades of the triangle buildings.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) C. Marshall Finnan,
Superintendent.

Mr. Moore said there is no question about the necessity of planting the elms but Mr. Finnan wants to be officially advised as to whether the trees ought to be planted. Mr. Clarke said they ought to be placed so that they will properly frame the buildings and that a study should be made to show the relation of the trees to the architectural composition.

The Commission approved the planting of the elm trees but requested that a location plan be submitted before they are planted so that the Commission may check their location along Constitution Avenue. (Exhibit H)

11. LEE HIGHWAY: The Secretary reported that pursuant to the action of the Arlington County Board in rezoning part of the Lee Highway immediately west of Arlington Cemetery from residential A to permit commercial develop-

ment on a plot of ground owned by one man, he had reported the matter to Mr. Thomas MacDonald, Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads. A letter was received from Mr. MacDonald stating that in view of the information furnished he had withdrawn approval of the plans to begin construction of the road. (Exhibit I) The Government is spending $75,000 and the State of Virginia a similar amount.

12. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS:

a. Apartment Building. A design was received from Mr. J. Himmelheber for an apartment building adjacent to Union Station Plaza at First and C Streets, N. E. Mr. Moore made the criticism that the windows ought all to be the same size so that the small windows will not advertize themselves as being bathroom windows. Mr.Howells did not care for the tower-like structures on the ends of the building. Mr. Borie suggested that the indented portions be "pulled out" and that the jutting out portions be "pulled in". In reply to Mr. Howells' question Mr. Moore said there is no obstacle as far as a building projection law is concerned. Mr. Moore wondered if an entrance could not be placed in the center but Mr. Borie noted that his arrangement is such that they cannot do this. Again as to the "towers", Mr. Borie thought them a bit queer but did not consider them unsatisfactory. Mr. Moore told the Commission that the architect is a young man and will appreciate any help possible the Commission can give him.

Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, was informed of the project but he interposed no objection to the erection of the apartment at the site in question.

The criticisms of the Commission were brought to Mr. Himmelheber's attention.

b. Lunch Room Facing Pennsylvania Avenue: A sketch was received from Mr. Arthur Heaton for a lunch room on D Street between Tenth and Eleventh Streets facing Pennsylvania Avenue. The architect members of the Commission felt that the sketch indicated the type of building that might be built in the location proposed. A suggestion was made to simplify the roof line.

c. Remodeling Kauffman Store Building: A sketch was received for remodeling the store building of D. J. Kauffman. The plan indicated a type of building that would be appropriate for this location.

13. MURAL PAINTINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BUILDING: Under date of March 19, 1936, the following letter was received from Mr. Edward B. Rowan, Superintendent of the Section of Painting and Sculpture, Treasury Department, regarding mural paintings by John Stuart Curry for the Department of Justice Building:

March 12, 1936.

Dear Mr. Moore:

The Section of Painting and Sculpture herewith submits for the comment and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts eleven sketches and drawings, designed by Mr. John Stuart Curry, for two lunette panels in the vestibule leading to the Library, Fifth Floor, Lobby No. 9, Department of Justice Building, Washington.

The sketches are numbered in the order in which they were submitted to the Section and show the various revisions Mr. Curry has considered for his themes.

The architect and members of the Department of Justice have approved the general subject matter, which is as follows:

A. Trek Across Country to the West.

B. Freedom of the Slaves; with possible inclusion of "Arrival of Immigrants".

The Arrival of Immigrants has been discarded, as the theme does not readily lend itself to inclusion in a panel in which the major motif is one of the Freedom of the Slaves.

On March 16, Mr. Curry wrote the Section: "I want to reproduce the man and woman in No. 3 in the No. 4 arrangement. I can't do better than I did on the figure of the woman, and I shall throw it up from the small sketch by photography, as it is cut down in scale somewhat. I think the Negroes will be something different, and can make the gesture more one of rejoicing."

The comment and advice of the Commission regarding these sketches by Mr. Curry will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,
(Signed) Edward B. Rowan, Superintendent
Section of Painting & Sculpture.

The sketches were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Eugene Savage. He said he had but one reservation as to them and that is as to the scale, but added he would inspect the actual location for the paintings later in the day. Mr. Savage said there is no question about Mr. Curry's ability to do a good thing; he is one of the recognized painters of the country. The sketch, "Trek Across Country to the West", has improved steadily in the sketches presented. Mr. Savage after consultation with Mr. Howells suggested a few changes, which were endorsed by the Commission and were embodied in the report to Mr. Rowan. (Exhibit J)

Mr. Savage said he had also talked with Mr. Borie about the location and had a general idea just where they will be placed and that the scale seems to be just about right. Later in the day Mr. Savage went to the Department of Justice Building and inspected the location and reported that the scale proposed is about right.

Mr. Moore said that a few days ago Mr. Fraser was here and saw these sketches by Curry. Mr. Fraser made the statement that Curry is a good painter and that if left alone with these sketches he will produce some good paintings.

As to the other set of sketches entitled "Freedom of the Slave", Mr. Moore felt the mural painting in the Lincoln Memorial over Lincoln's Second Inaugural

Address is sufficient for a painting on this subject in Washington; further that the Second Inaugural has answered the South for all time, for we do not want to bring up the Civil War continually. Mr. Moore remarked that we already have numerous generals on horseback. In the circumstances the Commission decided to withhold criticism as to these sketches.

14. PUBLIC BUILDINGS BILL: Under date of March 25, 1936, a letter was received from Hon. Fritz G. Lanham, Chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, House of Representatives, requesting the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to Bill H. R. 11959, a bill "To amend the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings and for other purposes', approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630) as amended", as follows:

> Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire adequate sites for public buildings to be located within the areas hereinafter described, including suitable grounds, parking, and approaches necessary to a proper grouping of such buildings, the areas defined in the Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), as amended, within which sites or additions to sites for public buildings in the District of Columbia may be acquired, are hereby further extended, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, empowered, and directed to acquire, pursuant to the provisions of said Act, as amended, for the use of the United States, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in addition to the areas already authorized, any land and buildings, including properties belonging to the District of Columbia, which he may determine should be acquired, within the area west of Nineteenth Street Northwest, bounded by New York Avenue Northwest, E Street Northwest, and the Potomac River; also squares 122, 104, 81, 58, 59, 44, and 33; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized to carry out the purposes of the Act of May 25, 1926, as amended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The Commission considered the matter and decided that in amending the Act of 1926, it would be desirable to include in this bill the squares along Pennsylvania Avenue west of 17th Street, and certain squares south of the

Avenue and west to the Potomac. A report was sent to Mr. Lanham. (Exhibit K)

15. GROVER CLEVELAND MEMORIAL: Under date of March 21, 1936, the following letter was received from Mr. Gustavus Rogers, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Grover Cleveland Memorial Committee, Inc.:

March 21, 1936.

The Commission of Fine Arts
Navy Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

Our sub-committee on site expects to arrive at your offices on Friday afternoon, March 27th, at 2:30 o'clock P. M. (as peryour advice to us) with the purpose of selecting a site for the monument for former President Cleveland, and also to discuss the following matters with you:

1. Competition for the selection of the Sculptor. (Mr. Victor Frisch is no longer associated with the project.)

2. Competition for the selection of the architect. We expect to have with us Mr. J. J. Levison, the well known landscape architect and designer, to assist us in our conference with you.

We write to inquire whether it is your understanding that under the joint resolution of Congress, it will be necessary for us to notify the Committee on Library of the Senate and the House, so that the Committee may be represented in the conference, or perhaps we may ask you to kindly use your friendly offices in that direction.

May we also inquire whether in the conference on Friday, it will be possible for the site to be definitely agreed upon? We require this information, first:--because we desire to proceed as expeditiously as possinle so that the memorial may be immediately progressed, even though it be no more than for the laying of the cornerstone, for dedicatory exercises on March 18, 1937, which as you know is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Mr. Cleveland, and secondly: so that if there be no rule or objection of your department, that the motion picture news reels may be notified by us and also the Press to be present.

With renewed expression of our appreciation for your consideration and courtesy,

Cordially yours,
(Signed) Gustavus A. Rogers,
Chairman, Executive Committee.

Accordingly the committee met with the Commission of Fine Arts at 2:30 in the afternoon. The following members of the committee were present: Mr. Rogers, Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, Mr. George P. LeBrun and Mr. George H. Payne of the Federal Communications Commission, who, however, could not stay for this meeting because of a meeting of his Commission. (He said whatever the committee agreed to would be satisfactory to him.)

Before proceeding with the discussion Mr. Rogers expressed regret that Mayor La Guardia could not be present and read the following telegram received from him:

New York City,
March 27, 1936.

Gustavus Rogers,
Care Fine Arts Commission.

Regret exceedingly inability to be present at your meeting today. Wish you every success in your effort to secure suitable site for appropriate memorial to Grover Cleveland. You may count on my continued and whole-hearted cooperation.

F. H. La Guardia, Mayor.

Also Congressman Celler sent the following telegram expressing regret at being unable to attend the meeting.

New York City,
March 27, 1936.

Hon. Charles Moore, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

Regret pressing engagements necessitated my return to New York prior to meeting of Grover Cleveland Memorial Committee. Assure you any action taken shall be agreeable with me.

Congressman Emanuel Celler.

Mr. Rogers said that in a general way he had become familiar with what has been done thus far towards the memorial to Grover Cleveland that at the

meeting of the committee with the Commission of Fine Arts on November 22, 1935, it had been agreed that $250,000 was a suitable amount to raise and that towards this sum thus far a pledge of $88,000 has been made by several states and $5,000 by large insurance companies in which Mr. Cleveland was interested, making a total of $93,000. Practically all of the Governors of the States have appointed committees to raise funds for the memorial. Also Mr. Rogers said they are expecting a substantial sum from the city of New York through Mayor La Guardia.

Continuing, Mr. Rogers said:

"Now the question in my mind is whether $250,000 is sufficient. I would say that we need $350,000 rather than $250,000. We consider this a national project. We feel that the amount depends upon the space to be covered--a memorial on a 7-acre plot would cost much more than one for a half acre. We have informally discussed the matter at an executive committee meeting and I think our goal is $350,000.

"To launch our campaign we propose to have a ceremonial dinner on April 29, at the Hotel Astor in New York. We hope to have the President of the United States with us or at least have a message from him that can be read at the dinner. Senator Wagner is to be the toastmaster; other speakers will be Congressman Celler, who introduced the legislation, and Mr. La Guardia, representing New York City. Senator Pittman has expressed a desire to come as also Senator Copeland. Dr. Finley of the New York Times has been invited and will make a short speech. We would also like to have the members of the Commission of Fine Arts present at the dinner. We expect to have a national hook-up to give the dinner wide publicity and with the nucleus we have we are going to make every effort to raise the full amount desired for the memorial.

We shall not ask for funds over the radio but will develop the sources of promised contributions resulting from the broadcast.

"My idea is that the plan of this Commission is to get a sculptor and architect as a result of competition. In some way a contract was awarded to Victor Frisch but we know that your Commission disapproved his sketch and took similar action with reference to his model. We do not protest the action of the Commission. John W. Davis asked where the memorial is to be placed and I told him the location had not been decided upon. When asked what he thought of the model he said, 'I have not seen the model but I have seen the sketch and I would have rejected it not knowing where the monument is to be placed.' Mr. Frisch is still interested in the memorial and claims he has certain rights. He wants about $3,000 for his work and we are going to settle up with him."

Two locations were thereupon considered--one on Pennsylvania Avenue at Fourth Street at the apex of the Triangle and east of the Archives Building. This site would be appropriate for a memorial fountain. Mr. Rogers said they do not want a man on horseback or a statue of a man in frock coat and tie. The other site considered is at 16th and Kennedy Streets at the location of the old reservoir. Mr. Levison, the landscape architect, said the Secretary had mentioned the site to him this morning and since then he and Mr. LeBrun had been up to see it. Mr. Levison said that it is a naturalistic site and would give opportunity to do a fine thing but it is a long distance away and is not particularly related to Washington. There is room for a monument and a memorial building.

Mr. Moore was asked what he thought of the location. He said that the committee should first of all consider that Grover Cleveland was a President of the United States. What will happen is that Sixteenth Street will be the main entrance to Washington from the north, which Congress has named the Blair Portal in honor of Montgomery Blair who was Postmaster General under President

Lincoln. Mr. Moore said he had in mind the development of the grounds at the old reservoir as the Cleveland Gardens and if the committee wants to do a really fine thing for Washington, that is a location where it can be done. Mr. Moore asked Mr. Howells what he thought of the matter.

Mr. Howells said that he was not familiar with the subject nor with the site; that if they wished a building for a memorial it could be most anything from a purely decorative sort of thing as a temple to a utilitarian building; Mr. Howells added that he did not know anything better than a park treatment. Otherwise they should build up a plan for the type of building they have in mind--whether utilitarian or monumental.

Mr. Rogers said that for the present they must confine their activities to a monument because he did not think they could raise more than $350,000 but believed that in the years to come a memorial building could be erected when they would want a site where such a building could be built. Their association is incorporated and the work of the association can be perpetuated in this way.

Mr. Rogers said the President asked him a month ago whether he had selected a site and he (Mr. Rogers) replied that he did not think a site had been selected. The President said that Mr. Rogers should hurry and select a site because they have only a year. To this statement Mr. Rogers answered that he did not think they could do much more than lay the connerstone March 18, 1937, the 100th anniversary of the birth of Grover Cleveland.

Mr. Levison said: "The Sixteenth Street site is a naturalistic location to develop for a memorial and the only thing that makes me think twice about it is that it is a long way out, but Mr. Moore has cleared that up." Mr. Moore said that he had seen the development of Washington and that the number of

visitors depends on how good a monument is. In the case of the Saint-Gaudens in Rock Creek Cemetery thousands of people go miles out of their way to see it every year.

Mr. Moore said he had given some thought to the reservoir site and it occurred to him the other day that at the entrance to the District would be the Montgomery Blair Portal, a little farther down on another hill could be a memorial to Thomas Jefferson; then would come the Grover Cleveland Memorial; in Meridian Hill Park there is the Buchanan Memorial and at the end of 16th Street is the Andrew Jackson monument--five great Democrats on an important street in Washington.

Mr. Borie explained to the committee the advantages offered by the American Institute of Architects for conducting a competition. He said that the Institute has a standard form for conducting the competition. If the memorial is to be an architectural one there should be an architectural adviser who would cooperate with the sculptor and landscape architect.

Mr. Moore then called attention to the excellent competition conducted by Dean Meeks as the architectural adviser for the Federal Reserve Board, the building for which is now being built at 20th Street and Constitution Avenue. The architectural adviser would receive a nominal sum for conducting the competition and this gives assurance of an excellent result. He could also attend to the appointment of the jury without being himself a member of it.

Thereupon the committee in company with the members of the Commission visited the reservoir site and drove about the grounds. Mr. Moore thought the reservoir could be developed as an open-air amphitheater and there would still be ample space for other memorial features desired with the project. Mrs. Harriman was enthusiastic about the location. The nine-acre tract would be

ample for a place for out-door concerts and recreational facilities as also for a rose garden, in connection with a monument to Cleveland or a memorial building.

A report will be sent to Mr. Rogers. (Exhibit J)

16. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LANDSCAPE PLANS: The following plans were submitted by Mr. Malcolm Kirkpatrick in behalf of the National Park Service. They were inspected by Mr. Clarke and his suggestions with reference to each plan were approved by the Commission. The plans were as follows:

Great Smoky Mountains National Park: Little Pigeon River Bridge Site No. 7, Drawing No. NM HSM 1119, consisting of two sheets. In conjunction with these plans Mr. Gutterson submitted photographs of the models showing elimination of the belt course. The plans were approved with the provision that they be developed without the belt course shown on the present drawings.

Great Smoky Mountains National Park: Bridge Site No. 8, Drawing No. NP GSM 1120-B, Preliminary Architectural Plan. This was approved as submitted.

George Washington Memorial Parkway: Lee Boulevard Overpass, Drawing No. NCP 1609-A. This was approved with the condition that the springing lines of each of the three arches be tilted off the horizontal plane so that an inclined line approximately paralleling the incline of the parapet profile would pass through each of the springing lines. Mr. McNary and Mr. Gutterson said that this could be done when detailed plans are developed.

Turkey Thicket Playground, Field House: As suggested by Mr. Vint, Mr. Kirkpatrick presented the unfinished and as yet unnumbered drawings which Mr. Haussmann had on the boards. These showed the revisions to the field house to provide a two story game room and an exterior access to the basement toilets. These plans were approved with minor modifications; one of

these was a change in the location of the chimney, which Mr. Clarke discussed with Mr. Haussmann and which Mr. Haussmann felt could be provided for. The plans were left with the Commission for further review by the architect members, by whom a few minor suggestions were made. The plans were approved with the request that these changes be incorporated in the detailed drawings.

Rawlins Park: General plan, cross section and perspective. These plans were reviewed in detail by Mr. Clarke, and while the basic idea of the scheme is acceptable, certain changes were suggested, and the corrected plan will be submitted to Mr. Clarke for final review. Specifically, Mr. Clarke recommended against the four secondary entrances on E Street north and south, saying that these would lead to indiscriminate crossing of the street by pedestrians between the park and the buildings, and would result in a serious traffic hazard on these important thoroughfares. Mr. Finnan, who was present at this discussion, agreed that this adjustment was desirable.

Petworth Playground: General plan, Drawing No. NCP 1756-A, sheet one of four sheets. This plan was approved with the suggestion that the hedges surrounding the children's play areas be moved out to the edge of the abutting park sidewalks. The hedges along the building line will remain as shown.

Hamilton Playground: General plan, Drawing No. 1763. This plan was approved with the suggestion that the cross walk on the Hamilton Street side of the field house be eliminated.

Chevy Chase Recreation Center. General plan, Drawing No. NCP 1762. Approved with the suggestion that the informal walks be widened to 10 feet to permit the passage of maintenance trucks and equipment.

Phoebe Hearst School: Planting plan, Drawing No. NCP 1769. This plan was approved as submitted.

The Commission adjourned at 5:30 p. m. The Commission had as their guest at luncheon at the Cosmos Club, Hon. Robert Luce, former member of Congress.

c o p y

March 28, 1936.

Dear Mr. Rowan:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 27, 1936, considered the enlarged model of Benjamin Franklin by William Zorach for the Postmaster General's reception room. The Commission report as follows:

The model as submitted lacks the character of Franklin and also lacks the masculinity that was Franklin's. The figure is hardly seven heads high. The costume does not have the character of the times and the arrangement of the cloak as held by the arms seems unreasonable.

Benjamin Franklin was one of the great men of his time. This is essentially not a statue of a great man. The model is far below the average work of the artist. The Commission recommend that Mr. Zorach make a new model for the statue embodying the criticisms above indicated.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Mr. Ed Rowan, Superintendent,
Section of Painting and Sculpture,
Procurement Division,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A

C O P Y

April 6, 1936.

Dear Mr. Downs:

In reply to your letter of March 26th, I would say that I think the proper notation in regard to the ownership of the Benjamin Franklin portrait would be:

From the collection of portraits in the White House, Washington.

Cordially yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Joseph Downs, Curator,
Department of the American Wing,
The Metropolitan Museum of Art,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT B

C O P Y

March 28, 1936.

Dear Mrs. Rahn:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 27, 1936, had before them your letter of March 25, concerning a proposed memorial which the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War wish to dedicate at the time of their convention in Washington next September. The Commission suggest that this memorial take the form of a bench for the National Cemetery on Georgia Avenue near Fort Stevens. If this meets with the approval of your committee, the consent of the Secretary of War for placing the bench in the cemetery should be secured.

The bench should be designed by a competent architect.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mrs. K. Rahn,
Daughters of Union Veterans
of the Civil War,
143 Uhland Terrace, N. E.,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

C O P Y

March 28, 1936.

Dear Mr. Smith:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 27, 1936, approved your design for the shaft to be erected by the National Society of the Daughters of the American Colonists and also the sculptural relief by Carl Mose proposed for the monument.

The Commission suggest that the subjects be carved in the shaft rather than on the panels.

The Commission have selected as a location for the memorial a site about halfway between E Street and Constitution Avenue west of Fifteenth Street.

The Commission advise that it would be better to use granite for the shaft rather than limestone.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Delos H. Smith,
1707 I Street,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

C O P Y

March 28, 1936.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were surprised and painted to see that lightning rods had been placed on the eagles and tripods at the Arlington terminus of the Memorial Bridge composition.

The Commission regard these lightning rods a distinct and serious mutiliation of works of art. Had the matter been submitted to the Commission they would have unhesitatingly and emphatically advised against such action.

It is the experience of the members of the Commission that the danger apprehended is too remote to justify the serious impairment of statuary that is so fine and has cost so much.

The seriousness on the artistic side even transcends the humor of putting lightning rods on the American Eagle.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. A. B. Cammerer, Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT E

C O P Y

March 28, 1936.

Dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 27, 1936, considered with you and the Architectural Advisory Board of the Treasury Department the revised plans for the Government Printing Office extension.

The Commission heard with interest Mr. Klauder's statement in explanation of the plans. After consideration the Commission approved the plans as presented for the extension of the main building of the Government Printing Office to H Street, the construction of the warehouse on the east side of North Capitol Street and the construction of the viaduct in connection with the warehouse.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. Louis A. Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F

C O P Y

April 2, 1936.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE:

The present status of the Jusserand Memorial project is shown by the inclosed copy of a letter to Dr. Francklyn Paris. When the memorial was originally projected unlimited money was said to be available. The death of a number of the original promoters has caused a drop in the available funds to about $5,000.

Again, the National Park Service has demurred to the location tentatively selected in the Rock Creek Parkway, and their arguments seemed reasonable.

The question now comes on a change of location and a simplification of the design. The fundamental idea is to keep the memorial subordinate to the park features of its location and at the same time to make a simple and dignified remembrance of a long-time honored Ambassador, who took great satisfaction in the beauties of the Rock Creek Parkway.

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

EXHIBIT G

C O P Y

March 30, 1936.

Dear Mr. Finnan:

Your letter of February 4, as to the planting of elm trees along Constitution Avenue adjacent to the new buildings in the Triangle received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 27, 1936. The Commission advise that these trees be planted from Sixth to Fifteenth Street. However, the Commission request a plan showing the location of the trees, before planting them, with a view to arranging the spacing.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. C. Marshall Finnan,
Superintendent,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT H

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

IN YOUR REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO FILE No. T-1

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
WASHINGTON, D. C.
MAR 28 1936
NOTED

March 27, 1936

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Navy Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 23 and attached copies of correspondence and newspaper item relative to the action of the County Board of Arlington County, Virginia in rezoning part of the Lee Highway from residential A to allow commercial occupancy.

The project in question is designated in our records as Virginia Federal-aid Project No. 470, Section B. On February 29 we advised our District Engineer in charge of Federal-aid work in Virginia that the plans for this project had been reviewed and found generally satisfactory. Certain minor modifications were found desirable, but these could readily be carried out during construction. It appears that the action of the County Board was taken subsequent to our approval of the plans for the project, and this action, of course, materially changes conditions under which the plans were approved.

In view of the above circumstances, we are today advising Commissioner H. G. Shirley of the Virginia Department of Highways that our approval of the plans for the project is withdrawn pending satisfactory adjustment of the zoning matter.

We believe that the plans as prepared by the State Highway Department for this project have been excellently developed, and we trust that the delay in construction occasioned by the action of the Arlington County Board will soon be satisfactorily adjusted so as to permit construction to proceed.

Very truly yours,

Thos. H. MacDonald

Chief of Bureau.

I

C O P Y

March 30, 1936.

Dear Mr. Rowan:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 27, 1936, considered the sketches by John S. Curry for mural paintings in the vestibule leading to the library on the fifth floor, lobby No. 9, of the Department of Justice Building. Mr. Curry is recognized as an artist of training and ability, capable of carrying to successful completion the sketches vaguely presented.

Of the composition entitled "Trek across the Country", Mr. Savage, the painter member of the Commission, makes these observations, in which the members fully concur: The composition shows a progressive and well studied improvement from the first to the latest sketch made. Preference in the management of details is as follows: The central group is less confined to a sculpturesque group and is given more forward movement by the repeated extension of the horses heads and feet to the left in 2A, than in the case of 6A, where there is an abrupt line ending the group. The horizontal of the pointing arm being repeated by the covered wagon below it in 2A is preferred to the treatment of the same part in 6A. Otherwise 6A is the bigger expression of the design.

The Commission suggest that the word trek was not imported into this country from South Africa until after our frontier had disappeared.

The Emancipation sketches seem questionable as being violent expressions of emotions now undergoing the scrutiny of historical students. May we not leave the treatment of this subject where Lincoln left it in his Second Inaugural inscribed on the walls of the Lincoln Memorial. If the subject is to be handled at all in the Justice Building, a less vociferous expression of the event, and a study of its resulting benefits would seem to offer to the artist a larger field and a greater scope for his abilities.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Mr. Ed Rowan,
Superintendent,
Section of Painting and Sculpture,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT J

C O P Y

April 10, 1936.

My dear Mr. Lanham:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on March 27, 1936, discussed the bill referred to them in your letter of March 25.

During the twenty-five years from its creation, this Commission has been guided by the L'Enfant plan of 1792, as approved by President Washington, and as reaffirmed and amplified by the Plan of 1901. It is in no spirit of controversy, therefore, that this Commission now adheres to those plans in making report to you. During the past decade the Commission of Fine Arts has from time to time advised Congress and the Executive officers of the Government along the lines of carrying out those two time-tested plans, which are best calculated to bring about dignity, convenience and good order.

This Commission believe that the permanent interests of the national capital will best be conserved by placing future public buildings of the Departmental class around Lafayette Square and along Pennsylvania Avenue west of the White House. This is the largest and finest concept which this Commission can conceive. Nothing short of the finest conception for their capital city satisfies the American people.

Two fundamental principles, based on the original plan of Washington, and calculated to bring about the dignified and harmonious development of the national capital, were embodied in the Plan of 1901.

The first of these principles was that the Capitol should be surrounded by buildings related to the legislative work of the Government. When the Plan of 1901 was reported to Congress the Library of Congress already had been constructed--unfortunately across Pennsylvania Avenue, thus destroying one of the great vistas opened on the original plan. The Senate and the two House office buildings were located in accordance with the plan. The location of the Supreme Court Building was fixed so as to keep open the Maryland Avenue vista. The Union Station was lowered so as to preserve the supremacy of the Capitol group. A semi-circular plaza was provided in front of the Union Station, and subsequently Congress opened the entire area between station and Capitol. This created an ideal composition of great dignity and convenience.

EXHIBIT K

The second of the two principles was that the White House should be recognized as the center of the Executive group of Departmental buildings. This principle is now in question. In locating the Treasury Department and the building of the State, War and Navy, this fundamental principle was observed. During the World War Congress provided for the construction of one-third of a building designed to occupy the entire east frontage of Lafayette Square. The purchase of this frontage was (and still is) authorized. The building was designed, but only one-third of it has been constructed. The cornice line of this Treasury Annex was carefully fixed to preserve the dignity of the White House.

In the haste of war times and the urgent need of office space, the plans of a building designed for a hotel, but never financed, were taken over and the War Risk Insurance building of abnormal height and architecturally unsatisfactory was constructed at the corner of Vermont Avenue and H Street. Then the Chamber of Commerce of the United States purchased the corner of Connecticut Avenue and H Street, and there erected a monumental building, with the same cornice line as that of the Treasury Annex. Thus two points were fixed with relation to the White House and the proper development of the frontage on Lafayette Square.

The frontage on the west of Lafayette Square was set apart for a Department of State building--an assignment approved by President Wilson and Secretary of State Lansing. For reasons not necessary to go into, this particular project met opposition at the time and as a result a collection of miscellaneous buildings, some old, some new, now occupy this west frontage. It is not to be supposed that the American people, jealous for the dignity of their capital, will suffer this anomalous condition long to continue.

Today the War Department and the Navy Department need new and larger buildings. The bill you have referred to this Commission for advice contemplates the taking of certain squares in the area south of F Street and west of Seventeenth Street, on which to construct the required War and Navy Buildings.

During the several years that the location of these particular buildings has been under discussion, the Commission of Fine Arts have kept in mind the principle of making the White House the center of executive work. They are convinced that the dignity and effectiveness of the buildings themselves, the harmonious development of Washington, the convenience of both occupants of the buildings and of the public require that the War and the Navy Buildings be located on Pennsylvania Avenue which will always be the great thoroughfare of Washington. The same considerations that led to placing the recently constructed Departmental buildings along Pennsylvania Avenue from the Treasury to the Capitol, call for location of the War and the Navy Buildings along this broad and dignified thoroughfare.

It may be pointed out that the same degeneracy in private buildings which led Congress to clean up Pennsylvania Avenue east of Fifteenth Street is now going on along the western end of that Avenue. As to the question of the cost of land, that has various answers.

First, the Government has for years rented three large buildings in this area, and still does so.

Secondly, a portion of the most valuable Pennsylvania Avenue frontage is now used as an open-air garage!

Thirdly, every Departmental building in the National Capital should be constructed according to the highest standards of architectural taste and in the most dignified and convenient locations, having always consideration for the great plan of the city.

Satisfaction has come from following that plan; regrets have resulted from violating it.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. Fritz G. Lanham, Chairman,
Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.